

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 11-14 under 35 USC §101 in light of the further amendments to claim 11 wherein the step of providing a physical medium used to construct the representation is more clearly recited. The claims now recite a process that operates on the physical medium to produce the recited representations and are statutory.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claim 14 under 35 USC §112 is respectfully requested. As noted holography is a mature art with many known techniques for forming and displaying holographic images. The PTO is specifically referred to USP 6,178,018 for evidence that it is known how to generate holograms with computers. It is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been aware of such techniques.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of the claims over the prior art. It is submitted that not only there is no reason to combine the references as proposed. The PTO admits that Boboliebov fails to teach one to create a graphical representation of the model of an elementary particle, and it would, therefore, be unobvious to use Boboliebov as a basis for doing so. Moreover, the proposed combination would not provide the claimed invention because the IRIS system could not be used in coordination with Boboliebov.

It is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication thereof is respectfully requested. The examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if any matter remains outstanding.

All necessary extensions of time are hereby requested. Please charge
any fee deficiency and credit any excess to deposit account 50-1088.

Respectfully submitted,
CLARK & BRODY



Conrad J. Clark
Reg. No. 30,340

Suite 250
1090 Vermont Ave., NW
Washington, D.C. 20005
202-835-1111
202-835-1755(fax)
July 29, 2009